

7-20-2010

Notes on “Review of Beaumont on the Gastric Juices” (Experiments and Observations) in the Western Medical Gazette of Cincinnati, May 1834

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.wustl.edu/beaumont_1834



Part of the [Medicine and Health Sciences Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Notes on “Review of Beaumont on the Gastric Juices” (Experiments and Observations) in the Western Medical Gazette of Cincinnati, May 1834. Beaumont, William. Bernard Becker Medical Library Archives. Washington University School of Medicine, Saint Louis, Missouri. http://digitalcommons.wustl.edu/beaumont_1834/3

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Correspondence (1807-1879) at Digital Commons@Becker. It has been accepted for inclusion in 1834 by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Becker. For more information, please contact engeszer@wustl.edu.

1

Observations on a "Review of Beaumont on the Gastric Secret" in the
May n^o. of the "Western Medical Gazette" of Cincinnati. By a
Reader.

Having read the Review and the work on which it animadverts,
believing that the Review is incorrect in some instances, I am in-
duced to present the following remarks.

It has long been a subject of surprise to me that many
of our Reviewers should indulge so freely in the Ex parte manner of
writing, as they do: and no less of admiration, that authors should
bear with it, content that their works should receive from the public
such patronage only, as the Reviewer's Judgment should induce.
I say Judgement, not intending however to charge these Critics
with having carefully read an Author, weighed his arguments, &
from candid consideration pronouncing a Verdict: not intending
to charge them with having given a work a fair trial & then pro-
nouncing against their own Convictions. I am far from alleging
any thing of the kind — I mean the Judgment founded on
the slight & partial statements which they publish: a kind of skipping
hopping, & jumping sort of examination which they bestow on a book,
touching here & there for an extract to show the author's meaning, &c,
& totally unmindful of the intermediate parts, which should be taken
in connection, & which explain his meaning: holding up a few de-
tached words here to show his mode of reasoning, & a paragraph
there, to expose his belief, opinion, or doctrine; & perhaps influenced by
some predilections on the subject.

The generality of the criticisms of the day appear to be cut
out & applied by rule, which may be placed under three heads as follows:
1st A work shall receive unlimited & general praise, without being sub-
jected to the ordeal of a reading, or, if read, without going to the trouble
of pointing out its special merits — 2nd A book shall be
condemned intoto, & sacrificed at once to the Reviewer's prejudices,
without even being allowed the shadow of a trial. Or, 3^d If a
critic be at the trouble of a perusal, he shall be allowed, [as a
compensation probably] indiscriminately, to praise & censure the good &
the bad to his heart's content, or till he shall have extended his
remarks, regardless of facts or fairness, to a sufficient length to show
his learning & acuteness, & make the proper appearance: in short, till
he has fitted the author to the Procrustean standard of his own opinions
& prejudices, & made an Article! —

2 There are exceptions, it is true, honorable exceptions, characterizing our higher Reviews: & even in our less noted periodicals, there are instances in which "The Rules" are not rigidly conformed to: & sometimes we see bright gleams of Candor & justice break forth & diffuse their light over the mind & dissipate Errors & prejudices long cherished.

These Observations are not made with an invidious design of applying them enmasse to the Review in hand, but are called forth by the general & absolute tone & style of the Periodical press: Controlled as it is, in many cases, by the private views & opinions of the Publisher & Editors: ^{these} self constituted Jurors & Judges. Now for they are applicable to the case under consideration is left for the reader to pronounce.

The Reviewer very concisely states the circumstances by which the Author became possessed of the means to prosecute his "Experiments & Observations", which with the results, constitute the work under Review. He allows the opportunities afforded to the Author were of an "extraordinary kind", & adds "were probably never before enjoyed by any individual": Says "his researches seem to have been conducted with much patience & industry", & are "detailed with great Candor & apparent accuracy," & thinks "they will go far in determining one of the most interesting & intricate questions in the whole Science of Physiology", by which he means of course the properties of the Gastric Juice & its bearing on the Physiology of Digestion.

The Reviewer passes over the first Section (on Aliment) with the remark that "it does not contain any thing Original or novel". It does not, nor does the author claim it. There is however in it, what some might think pretty important data, respecting the digestibility of different aliments, wherein the Author differs from certain eminent Physiologists, & coincides with others, which, with his remarks on the various Condiments & Drinks, deserved a notice, if for no other reason than the Confirmation, (might I not say decision) they would give on a disputed point, by an experience founded on opportunities "such as were never before enjoyed by any individual". Perhaps the title "of Aliment," was not sufficiently imposing to attract the Reviewer's attention to the perusal of the Section, & he read it as slightly as he noticed it. Nothing uncommon I believe.

The Second Section (on "Hunger & Thirst") is honoured with more attention - The Reviewer thinks it "presents a very fair summary" of the "Opinions of some of the writers of the day on these interesting subjects," & remarks, "the author is of opinion that Physiologists heretofore have been in error." A very sweeping opinion truly, and, unaccompanied with any reasons, it seems very modest without. But does the author advance the opinion, without showing the grounds on which it is formed? Oh no! the Reviewer only forgets to mention them, & neglects to say that the author has any thing more to show, than, that it is his "opinion" - On referring to the book, I find that he demonstrates the opinions of "other Physiologists" to be erroneous because their grounds were fallacious & untenable - The Reviewer thinks the Author's "Views on the Subject bear the impress of novelty" & that it may not be "unreasonable to say that they are entitled to as much Consideration as any that have yet been proposed," but despairs of ever arriving at any correct information on the Subject, & hence, because he does not "expect" it, "the finest Specimen theory of the modern Physiologist cannot be regarded as a nearer approximation to the truth, than the most incongruous suggestions of Hippocrates & Galen" - Very logical indeed, & most admirably deduced from the premises - We may have better opportunities than the Ancients but cannot hope to approximate nearer the truth, because "we can never expect to arrive at any correct or satisfactory conclusion" - I cannot believe that the Reviewer would apply this generally to all Knowledge, & I look on it as evasive of a disposition for "damning with faint praise," by allowing our Author "Opportunities extraordinary," & giving him credit for "great Candor" "accuracy" "patience" & "industry," & then denying that he has any chance for better Knowledge on a "Topic so intricate" than others, who had no such opportunities, & whose "incongruous suggestions" the Reviewer thinks are as near the truth as can be hoped for.

The Author does not profess to have discovered the real cause of the Revelation of Hunger, on the ~~Reverse~~, he doubts that it will admit of it. But his Opportunities gave him a chance of testing the theories which had been advanced & he was convinced of their fallacy - His Superior advantages for examining the Subject he did not neglect, & his observations resulted in his forming a new Theory, which he submitted, with his reasons for it, to the scrutiny of Physiologists -

Had the Reviewer attentively considered the different Theories of the sensation of Hunger, he would not probably, have made the remark that "We are not a particle the wiser, in this respect, than our predecessors were 500 years ago." — It is generally conceded that Hunger is a sensation of the Stomach: — Can it then be said, with any degree of justice, that he who has a living healthy Stomach laid open to his Observations, knows, nor can know, any thing more of that sensation, than one who has not? Will it be believed, that nothing can be learnt of the functions & operations of an organ when it is exposed to view, & is examined day after day, in its variations of repose & Activity? — I imagine not. — Yet our Author was possessed of these, & the Ancients were not — Can we then agree with the Reviewer that we are not a "particle the wiser"; not any more enlightened, on the subject? — Might we not as well say so with regard to the Circulation of the blood, or the use & distribution of the nerves?

The Reviewer proceeds next to point out the ambiguity of the Author's style, as follows

"It is difficult to conceive what Dr Beaumont means by the term 'Gastric Vessels'. One would suppose that he intended, it to designate the arteries & veins which are distributed to the Stomach, & which are usually described by Anatomists under this name. This however, does not appear to be the case: for immediately after using this expression, he observes 'the modifications in the parts to which the juice of Stomach is referred, I conceive to be a distention, by the Gastric juice, of a particular set of vessels or glands, constituting, in part, the erectile tissue of the Villous Coat of the Stomach' — Does our Author suppose that the Gastric juice exists already formed in the blood of the Stomach, or that it is contained in a particular set of vessels, which he denominates gastric, & which exist probably only in his imagination? For our own part, it is utterly impossible to ascertain his meaning, so exceedingly contradictory are his expressions, & so obscure his phraseology. — Hunger, it is well known, is experienced only, as a general rule, when the Stomach is empty, & it is a well ascertained fact that, in its state of Vacuity, the organ always contains more or less gastric fluid, amounting indeed, in some instances, to several ounces. — Instead, therefore, of this fluid being retained, so as to cause a distention of a particular set of

"Vessels or glands, as is maintained by Dr Beaumont, it is constantly
"thrown out upon the inner surface of the stomach, though not so
"abundantly as during digestion; & this for the very obvious reason,
"that the organ does not receive the same supply of blood when
"empty, as when distended with food. The Theory of Dr Beaumont
"must, therefore, fall to the ground, more especially as he himself
"has neglected to give it a precise name & habitation."

Why it is difficult for the Reviewer to conceive what is meant by
the term "Gastric Vessels," as used by the Author, is a question I must
leave himself to solve, as I can see no difficulty in the matter &
And why he "would suppose that he intended (by) it to designate the
Arteries & Veins of the stomach," when the author says the Gastric
Vessels are those "which secrete the gastric juice," & which constitute,
"in part, the erectile tissue of the villous coat of the stomach," ap-
-pears to be equally inexplicable. However the supposition arose,
it must soon have been discarded, as the Reviewer adds, "This does
not however seem to be the case," & then puts the question "Does
Our Author suppose that the gastric juice, exists already formed in
the blood of the stomach, or that it is contained in a particular
set of vessels, &c?" The question was uncalled for as the
quotation previously made by the Reviewer, plainly shows that
the Author did suppose that the Gastric Juice was secreted, by
a "particular set of vessels." And he might have read, though he
did not quote, that "On applying aliment to the internal coat
of the stomach, which in health is merely lubricated with mucus,
innumerable minute papillae, the orifices undoubtedly, of the gastric
Vessels, immediately throw out a quantity of the fluid, which mixes
with the food. This effect is too sudden, & the secretion too
copious, to be accounted for on the ordinary principles & laws
of secreting mucous surfaces. A large quantity of this fluid
must be contained in appropriate vessels, during a fast, ready
to obey the call of Aliment. I would not be understood to say,
that the whole quantity necessary for an ordinary meal, is elim-
-inated from the blood previous to the commencement of Alimen-
-tation: but that enough is contained in the gastric vessels to
produce the sensation of Hunger."

Does not this prove beyond all cavilling, what to any but the Reviewer

was plainly evident before, that the author's use of the term "Gastric Vessels," could not be tortured & twisted, without much ingenuity, to lead to the supposition that he meant by it "to designate the Arteries & Veins which are distributed to the stomach"? - As to the remark that "it is impossible to ascertain his (the Author's) meaning, so contradictory are his expressions & so obscure his physiology," I think, if the Case cited be an example, that the tables will be fairly turned, & it will be thought more owing to the obtuseness of understanding, or obliquity of disquisition, of the Reviewer, than to any fault of the Author. - If there were Cases of strong Contradiction in the book, the Reviewer most certainly showed a remarkable degree of leniency in quoting as he did, one where the Contradiction is palpable to all save himself: if not it was rather ungenerous to dwell so long on so small a foible.

The Reviewer states that it is a "well ascertained fact," that in a State of Vacuity the Stomach always contains more or less gastric fluid; & that therefore this fluid is not retained "in particular vessels so as to cause distention, but is thrown out." I will not stop to examine the very logical inference from the "Well authenticated fact;" but ask when, where & how, this fact was ascertained? - In another part of this Review we are informed that "this assertion is not based upon mere fiction, but on the result" "of numerous observations on animals destroyed for experimental purposes." It was but a few days since that we discovered "at least two ounces of this fluid in the stomach of a young dog, without the slightest admixture of alimentary substances: and this we believe will generally be found to be the case with animals that are killed, after having fasted 10 or 12 hours."

So, this "well authenticated fact" resolves itself into simply this: That in the stomach of dead animals gastric juice has been found in considerable quantities, & the Reviewer believes that it will "generally be found to be the case". Admirably "authenticated fact," resting on belief & supposition for proof! And it is on this ground he denies the Author's proposition, & with one stroke of the pen decrees, "The theory of Dr Beaumont must fall to the ground". Let us examine for a moment which has the ~~best~~ best ground & is entitled to the most credit -

The Reviewer has a dead dog — the author a living man: — the former is examining a Stomach relaxed by death & uncontrolled by vitality, — the latter one in its natural & healthy condition: One can view his only, in One light, & in a peculiar State, which, to say the least, is a dubious one on which to base a doctrine as to its active properties in another & entirely opposite State, — the other has viewed & Examined his in many different ways, & under a variety of Circumstances in disease & health, & performing its functions.

The Author publishes experiments where the Stomach has been examined, after fasting 10, 12, 14, & 18, hours, & invariably found it empty, & no gastric juice, until by irritating with aliment, or other substance, he caused it to flow: thus showing to a demonstration that the Stomach in its State of vacuity & in the absence of irritation does not contain gastric juice.

The Reviewer asserts that the fluid is thrown out in increased quantities during digestion, & that it is owing to a greater quantity of blood being supplied to the Stomach at that time — The inference is that gastric juice is suddenly formed from the blood, whenever food is present & requires digestion — That this is giving strange Chemical Properties to Aliment, alike extravagant & irrational — It throws upon it the office of separating from the blood, instantaneously, a certain peculiar part, competent to work the process of decomposition on itself — If the inference be denied, it brings us to allow, with the author, the existence of certain vessels which secrete & contain the gastric juice, ready to be poured into the Stomach on the call of Aliment — The Reviewer must embrace one horn of the dilemma — If the first, it is so palpably absurd as not to merit one moment's consideration: if the other it gives him no advantage, & clashes with his theory of the fluid being contained in the Stomach, except indeed he contends for both, a part in the Stomach & a part in the gastric vessels — But if the vessels are competent to hold part, why not all? Why empty a part into an Organ where it is liable to be injured by dilution with drinks, & of escaping before it has done its Office?

The Reviewer says that there is always gastric juice in the Stomach — Perhaps his idea is that when a meal is taken the juice

Now present begins the digestion, & that during the process more is gradually eliminated, from the increased supply of blood, to complete it. This is giving him the broadest ground, that the construction of his language will possibly admit of, & his proposition stands thus: "Distention by aliment & an increased supply of blood to the stomach, is necessary to produce an increased flow of gastric juice." Now then does he account for a plentiful flow of gastric juice from the coats of the stomach, when irritation only is applied? It cannot be from the blood, for there is no increase of it. It cannot be from the chemical properties of aliment, for there is none present. & we are again forced to allow with the author the existence of a "particular set of vessels," that secrete the gastric juice, which the Reviewer fancies exists only in the imagination of the author, but against which he has not brought one real argument.

But the Reviewer declares the Author's theory "must fall to the ground," "as he has neglected, to give it a name & habitation." It seems a work of supererogation to combat the illfounded assertions continually made by this Reviewer, they are so plain & visible. They almost seem as if put forth at random, reckless whether they hit the Author or recoil on the Reviewer's own head. Not a "name & habitation" given! when the instant before the Reviewer was denying its correctness? Has not located it! when he says "the modifications in the parts to which the sense of Hunger is referred, is a distention, by the gastric juice, of a particular set of vessels or glands, constituting, in part, the erectile tissue of the villous coat of the stomach." Not enough, and more than enough, has been said in refutation of assertions, which to reasonable minds, carry with them their own antidote. (Quere) Was the Reviewer bent on verifying personally the maxim, "Out of thy own mouth will I condemn thee"?

The next Objection the Reviewer makes is a bitter one, that the Author's reasoning would go "to reduce the stomach to a mere chemical laboratory, & to attribute to it no higher functions than that of a mere reservoir ^{for} food, or an elaborator of the gastric juices." Alas poor stomach! What degradation art thou doomed to! "How fallen from thy high estate"! Thine ancient dignity departed - robbed of thy titles. No longer art thou "the seat of the soul", the

"Sanctuary of the body," the residence of the "Archons" of Van Helmont, or the "Golden Kingdom of Saturn" of the Poets; but art degraded to a mere receptacle of vile food, made a Kitchen for the whole body, & a workshop for a villainous poor fluid to practice Chemistry in. Instead of being respected as the Sawmill, Grindmill, grater, incisor or masticator, (which perhaps the Reviewer would have thee) thou art regarded merely as a shop, in which the work is carried on by another power, that allows thee only to keep the material moving, till he shall have acted on it! — Alas! Alas! that it should come to this, that thou shouldst be the laboratory and not the laborator!

But seriously, what does the Reviewer contend for? His language would lead us to believe that the "Complex & delicate organization" of the Stomach, gives "peculiar vital powers" to the "Anatomical arrangement of the villi or glands on its inner surface," which acts in a positive manner on aliment, by cutting & dividing it, then converting into one uniform & Homogeneous mass, & finally by some wondrous change of effect of these "peculiar vital powers" of the Coat of the Stomach, this mass is diluted & becomes chyme. — Ridiculous! — In endeavoring to do away with a theory founded on facts, detailed in the work under review at length, which attributes digestion to the gastric juice: the Specific Solvent Powers of which have been fully tested out of the Stomach, by being put in glass vials with aliment, & kept at the natural heat, & where no Chemio-vital action of "Complex & delicate organization" was present, but where, nevertheless, digestion proceeded as naturally & almost as speedily as in the Stomach itself: — In his anxiety to do away with this theory, I say, the Reviewer has put forth one, which has no foundation to rest on, other than that food is digested in the Stomach: from which he sagaciously draws the conclusion, that the Stomach is the digestor. In other words he opposes suppositions to facts, or, rather he denies a theory based on facts, to support a theory based on hypothesis, for he disdains to proceed to the mimetic of showing the experiments on the one hand, & the hypothetical arguments on the other.

This is not the only omission the Reviewer can be charged with. He omits a part of the Author's theory, & withholds, while discussing, & the

Subject, the author's opinion that the peculiar motions of the stomach in connection with its heat, essentially aid in the process of digestion: and would have it inferred that the author considers the stomach merely as a passive receptacle, & as having no agency in the Chymification of Aliment - That such is not the Author's meaning, I adduce for proof, the following extract from his book -

"That Chymification is effected by the solvent action of the gastric juice, aided by the motions of the stomach, & the natural warmth of the system, not any doubt can remain in the mind of any candid person, who has had an opportunity to observe its effects on alimentary substances, or who has the liberality to credit the opinion, of those who have had such opportunities."

If the extract means any thing: if its language conveys any idea, it certainly is very different from what the Reviewer would make it appear.

But, says the Reviewer, he calls the stomach an "Elaborator of the gastric juice": to which I reply he calls us such thing: on the contrary he discards the idea of gastric juice being in the stomach, except when excited by some stimulus, & distinctly says that a "particular set of vessels" secrete, or, if the Reviewer prefers it, elaborates, the gastric juice.

The Author, however, is not to escape in this manner. He differs too widely from the Reviewer to allow him to get off so easily, & accordingly the powers of his mind are called in question, & the Reviewer proceeds, on the instant, to pass judgment on him & very complacently pronounces that "Physiologists, whose reasonings are so confined, & so obscured by favorite or preconceived notions, cannot, it is obvious, take that enlarged view of an organ, whose anatomical ~~and~~ ^{relations} are alone sufficient to indicate its immense importance in the animal economy" - What Physiologists? Those who advocate the doctrine that the gastric juice is the specific solvent of aliment - That now is what might be called a real "Knock down argument" - Before we proceed any further it would be well to see who, besides the author, are referred to in the Reviewer's denunciation - We find the names of Tiedeman, Smolin, Secret, Sallaigne, Broussais, Richerand, Postock, Dunglison, Silliman, Spallanzani & many others - A pretty fair array of talents in the eyes of the scientific world, & whose reasonings have hitherto been thought

far other than "Confined," & instead of being "obscured by favorite or preconceived notions," they were supposed to have burst the bonds of error & prejudice, to have differed from long received doctrines, & to have plunged into the Arcana of Nature in search of true Knowledge. It ~~seems~~ seems though, ~~that~~ "we have been mistaken all this while," & that they are men of "reasonings Confined & minds obscured" - And how is it proved? Why, forsooth, they do not take that "enlarged view" of matter, or such a view, as a certain Reviewer - In faith, the reason is as good as the Charge is appropriate -

The Reviewer zealously contends that gastric juice is always present in the Stomach, whether filled or empty - Some remarks on the point appear in a former part of this Paper, but as he so vehemently urges the position, I recur to it for the purpose of adding a few remarks to those already made - He rests his position on the "Well ascertained fact" that gastric juice has been found in the Stomach of dead Animals, & the belief that it will "generally be found to be the case" - What does this prove? Nothing more than that after death the gastric juice is sometimes found in the Stomach - It might be owing to peculiar circumstances attendant on the case - It may be that death relaxes the gastric vessels, & the fluid not being restrained flows into the Stomach - Allow him the most that he can strain from his "Well authenticated fact" & he can work out but a "lame & impotent conclusion" - It does not prove that there is gastric juice in the healthy living Stomach when in a state of vacuity - The Author, however, does prove, by many & varied experiments on the healthy living Stomach that it is not present - I presume the Reviewer will allow that when facts are to be had, they are more to be depended on than mere supposition or uncertain analogous reasoning, in deciding a disputed point - If he allows it, he must acknowledge the inferiority of his evidence - if he does not, I must leave him to his deep researches in Analogy, wishing him more success in future, than in the present case -

After giving the Author's account of the continual agitation of aliment during digestion, The Reviewer observes,

"This agitating motion is compared by Dr Beaumont to a kind of Churning, & is very pretty supposed to be designed to break up the

"alimentary bolus, as well as to separate the external & chymified"
 "portion of the food from the more crude & undigested particles, in order"
 "that they may, in their turn, be brought into contact with the gastric"
 "juice" Yet in face of this the Reviewer pretends to say that the author
 assigns to the Stomach the part merely of a "reservoir for food" — Does
 the Reviewer contend for any greater functions for the Stomach, than
 this Churning, mixing, breaking up & separating of its contents, & the
 ejection of the Chyme, as it is formed, into its proper receptacle?
 If he does not, what was the necessity of his previous criticism?
 If he does, it would, perhaps, be well for the cause of science to have
his theory, his arguments & facts, made public, which he neglected to
 do when denouncing another: without indeed, he puts forth the
 compound word Chemico-vital to stand for his theory, arguments & facts —
 It is a very good word, & a very comprehensive word, & a very useful word,
 but rather indifferent when used as an explanation — The
 precise manner in which the Reviewer uses it, excites admiration —
 There seems some concealed meaning, some hidden magic in it —
 Bless us what is it? A bugbear to frighten grown up children from
 looking too far into the secrets of science? Alack a day, the
 Reviewer should have remembered that in this "inquiring age"
 people require something more than a word to convince them, &
 that the use of high sounding, pompous epithets without any definite
 meaning attached to them, is looked upon more as a show of
 ignorance than learning — Some pronounce it Stultiloquence!

In the absence of more correct information I am tempted
 to believe that in the functions laid down, the Stomach finds
 work enough to keep it pretty actively employed, & that the
 additional duty of chemically solving, by the friction of its
 coats, its contents, would be imposing too much on the organ
 for its health & comfort, or that of the body.

After quoting the inferences which the author has drawn
 from his numerous experiments, the Reviewer says

"Whether these inferences are warranted by the facts de-"
 "tailed in the work, is, we think, exceedingly doubtful: we submit"
 "them to our readers without any comment of our own, persuaded"
 "they are fully competent to judge for themselves, whether or not"
 "they are entitled to all the force which is claimed for them"

I venture to say that his readers, should they confine themselves to his remarks on the work, would not, & could not, be qualified to "judge for themselves, whether or not the inferences are entitled to all the force which is claimed for them," & for this very good reason: they are not put in possession of the facts which elucidate them, & which give them the force claimed for them, but are left, in the absence of the knowledge thus thrown on the subject, to judge of the inferences, & the theory of the Author, from "preconceived opinions" & ordinary associations.

In reviewing a work which proposes novel opinions, or from which the Reviewed differs, it would seem to be no more than an act of justice to present the grounds on which the Author rests, or at least a fair synopsis of them, that his readers might have the case fairly before them, so as to be able to judge of the merits of the work. Our Reviewer so far from doing this, not only withholds the proofs, but perverts the meaning of the Author, & puts words in his mouth which he never used, in order, as it appears, to charge him with limited views & dim perceptions of the subject. Accuses him of being influenced by "preconceived opinions" in arriving at his conclusions, but does not adduce any proof to show that it is so. Indeed it seems as if the Reviewer had a mortal aversion to exhibiting proofs, facts & such like unnecessary matters, for he does not even produce them on his own side. He is content with making the Author assert one thing, while he asserts the opposite, & then as umpire, decides in his own favor. To be sure this course does not tend to throw any light on the subject, nor does it assist in the discovery of the truth, but then to persons whose "reasonings are unconfined," & of consequence illimitable, it is of little matter, as the brightness of their intellects will enable them to arrive at the truth at once, struck from collision with the subject like the spark from the flint, without the tedious & dull routine of examining.

In summing up, the Reviewer says "whatever defects there may be in the style, they are amply compensated by the interest & value of the materials." It is rather an equivocal compliment taken in connection with what preceded it, the more so as not even a specimen of the material is given. It may perhaps have appeared to the Reviewer, however, as having considerable force from the consideration

of the many Contradictions which ~~often~~ occur in the course of the review — So palpable are they, that it ~~would~~^{does} really seem, that the Reviewer had to use the "critics privilege" of finding (i.e. making) faults, or let the work pass without an objection — The book has faults, but unhappily the Reviewer lighted on the wrong spots: a very unfortunate circumstance, that perhaps he was not aware of.

I would not deny any man the privilege of his trade, which practice has sanctioned, but when it is so bunglingly used as in the present case, it merits & should receive a little castigation — Critics often misrepresent, but it is seldom we see them entangle themselves like this Reviewer, who in striving to make an argument against the author, disproves his own assertions.

In conclusion I remark that the unfairness of the Criticism incited me to answer it, & that

"Thus much I've dared, in a friend's cause to do,
To spin the Critic where he speaks not true."

O. P. I
m